



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,574	10/09/2003	Craig A. Paulsen	IGT1P102	2573
22434	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250				BROWN, VERNAL U
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2635				

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/605,574	PAULSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Vernal U. Brown	2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Paul Sen Craig for Universal Key Security Method And System filed 10/09/2003 has been examined. Claims 1-47 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-10, claim 1 recites the limitation of receiving a mechanical key in the lock. The key as claimed, illustrated (figure 7), and described on page 40 represents an electro-mechanical key and not a purely mechanical key. The examiner therefore interpret the key as claimed as an electromechanical key.

Claims 4 and 37 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner does not understand what is meant by any other step.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 24-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450.

Regarding claims 24-25 and 28-30, Lerchner et al. teaches an electromechanical lock securing a key access environment (figure 1) wherein reading a first source of indicia from a key and the indicia comprises a physical characteristic of the key (col. 6 lines 48-52) and reading a second source of indicia and the second source of indicia comprises user specific data and an authorization signal is provided based on the correct indicia with respect to the user (col. 4 lines 21-29). The data stored in the key (col. 6 lines 42-46) is the PIN information because this is the data that is read in order to provide authentication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 11-14, 20, 23, 31-32, and 35-36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemay et al. US Patent 6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450.

Regarding claims 1-3, 11-14, 23, 31-32, LeMay et al. teaches the use of a key for providing security to a gaming machine method of providing security in a gaming machine, the method comprising: receiving a mechanical key in a lock within said gaming machine (col. 2 lines 35-46) as illustrated figure 1. LeMay et al. teaches authorizing the use of the key based on the information read from the key (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching reading a first source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user. Lerchiner et al. in an art related locking device teaches reading a first source of indicia from a key and the indicia comprises a physical characteristic of the key (col. 6 lines 48-52) and reading a second source of indicia and the second source of indicia comprises user specific data (col. 4 lines 21-29). The data stored in the key (col. 6 lines 42-46) is the PIN information because this is the data that is read in order to provide authentication.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to read a first source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user in LeMay et al. as evidenced by Lerchiner et al. because LeMay et al. suggests authorizing the use of the key based on the information read from the key and reading a first source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user increases the security of the lock as evidenced by Lerchiner et al.

Regarding claims 20 and 35, LeMay et al. teaches the use of active PIN by reading the identification information on the key (col. 3 lines 9-16).

Claims 4-8 and 14-18, 33-34, 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMay et al. US Patent 6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 and further in view of Bradford et al. US patent 6709333.

Regarding claims 4-8 and 14-18, 33-34, and 37-40, LeMay et al. teaches reading information from the key which is specific to the user (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching the information specific to the user comprises biometric information. Bradford et al. in an art related identification system teaches the use of biometric information (col. 5 lines 20-25) for uniquely identifying a user and also teaches embedding the biometric identification information in a key (col. 5 lines 36-51) and the biometric information includes fingerprint, facial recognition, and retina scan (col. 5 lines 43-46) in order for the identifying means to be carried and use easily.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use biometric information as the user identification information in LeMay in view of Lerchner as suggested by Bradford because such would improve the ability to verify the identity of a person.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMay et al. US Patent 6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 in view of Bradford et al. US patent 6709333 and further in view of Gokcebay et al. US Patent 6374653.

Regarding claims 9 and 19, LeMay et al. teaches reading information from the key which is specific to the user (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching revoking a previously authorized user ID. Gokcebay et al. in an art related locking mechanism teaches a programmable lock and

teaches revoking a previously authorized ID by reprogramming the lock (col. 17 lines 12-19) for changing access to the locking device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to revoked a previously authorized user ID in LeMay et al in view of Lerchner in view of Bradford as evidenced by Gokcebay et al. because revoking a previously authorized user ID allows the access list to be updated and ensure that only authorized person have access t the locking mechanism.

Claims 10 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMay et al. US Patent6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 and further in view of Gokcebay et al. US Patent 6374653.

Regarding claims 10 and 21-22, LeMay et al. teaches reading information from the key which is specific to the user (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching revoking a previously authorized user ID. Gokcebay et al. in an art related locking mechanism teaches a programmable lock and teaches revoking a previously authorized ID by reprogramming the lock (col. 17 lines 12-19) and further restricting access of the authorized keys (col. 19 lines 36-44) for changing access to the locking device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to revoked a previously authorized user ID in LeMay et al in view of Lerchner in view of Bradford as evidenced by Gokcebay et al. because revoking a previously authorized user ID allows the access list to be updated and ensure that only authorized person have access t the locking mechanism.

Claims 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 and further in view of Bradford et al. US patent 6709333.

Regarding claims 26-27, Lerchner et al. teaches reading information from the key which is specific to the user ((col. 4 lines 21-29) but is silent on teaching the information specific to the user comprises biometric information. Bradford et al. in an art related identification system teaches the use of biometric information (col. 5 lines 20-25) for uniquely identifying a user and also teaches embedding the biometric identification information in a key (col. 5 lines 36-51) and the biometric information includes fingerprint, facial recognition, and retina scan (col. 5 lines 43-46) in order for the identifying means to be carried and use easily.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use biometric information as the user identification information in Lerchner et al. as evidenced by Bradford because Lerchner et al. suggests reading information from the key which is specific to the user and Bradford teaches the use of biometric information as identification information in order to ensure that the true identify of a person is verified.

Claims 41, 43-44, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemay et al. US Patent 6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 and further in view of Gatto et al. US Patent 6945870.

Regarding claims 41, 43-44 and 45-47, LeMay et al. teaches the use of al key for providing security to a gaming machine method of providing security in a gaming machine, the method comprising: receiving a mechanical key in a lock within said gaming machine (col. 2 lines 35-46) as illustrated figure 1. LeMay et al. teaches authorizing the use of the key based on the information read from the key (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching reading a first

source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user and gaming machine connected to a computer server. Lerchner et al. in an art related locking device teaches reading a first source of indicia from a key and the indicia comprises a physical characteristic of the key (col. 6 lines 48-52) and reading a second source of indicia and the second source of indicia comprises user specific data (col. 4 lines 21-29). The reference of Gatto et al. teaches gaming machines connected to a computer server 112 as shown in figure 1 and the server also providing a database (col. 11 lines 25-29) in order to provide a secure and modular architecture for monitoring a group of gaming machines

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to read a first source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user in LeMay et al. as evidenced by Lerchner et al. because LeMay et al. suggests authorizing the use of the key based on the information read from the key and reading a first source of information from the lock containing data specific to the lock and reading a second source of information containing data specific to the user increases the security of the lock as evidenced by Lerchner et al. The reference of Gatto et al. teaches gaming machines connected to a computer server 112 as shown in order to provide a secure and modular architecture for monitoring a group of gaming machines

Claims 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMay et al. US Patent 6439996 in view of Lerchner et al. US Patent 5826450 in view of Gatto et al. US Patent 6945870 and further in view of Bradford et al. US patent 6709333.

Regarding claim 42, LeMay et al. teaches reading information from the key which is specific to the user (col. 3 lines 9-16) but is silent on teaching the information specific to the user comprises biometric information. Bradford et al. in an art related identification system teaches the use of biometric information (col. 5 lines 20-25) for uniquely identifying a user and also teaches embedding the biometric identification information in a key (col. 5 lines 36-51) and the biometric information includes fingerprint, facial recognition, and retina scan (col. 5 lines 43-46) in order for the identifying means to be carried and use easily.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use biometric information as the user identification information in LeMay in view of Lerchner as evidenced by Bradford because LeMay et al. suggests reading information from the key which is specific to the user and Bradford teaches the use of biometric information as identification information in order to ensure that the true identify of a person is verified.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown
November 21, 2005

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

